

### Remarks

Claims 20-58 remain pending in the above-referenced application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The Examiner begins the Office Action by stating that "the amendments to independent claims 20, 23, 35, and newly submitted independent claims 50, 54, and 58, namely, the limitation 'a plurality of processing devices... each having corresponding driver-information devices...' is [sic] not supported by the specification and/or the drawings." Final Office Action at page 2. The first inaccuracy in this quote is the statement that claim 58 is an independent claim. It is not - it is dependent on claim 54. The second, and more glaring, inaccuracy is the quote that purports to have come from the claims. No claim in this application recites "a plurality of processing devices... each having corresponding driver-information devices..." Rather, claims 20 and 23 recite "a plurality of processing devices of a corresponding plurality of driver-information devices," and claim 35 recites "a plurality of driver-information devices, each driver-information device including a processing device." Claims 50 and 54 recite no limitation tracking either of the ones just quoted. So, in a sense, the Examiner is correct: the language the Examiner quotes is not supported by the specification or drawings. It just so happens, however, that this language also is absent from the claims themselves. With respect to the real claim language quoted above by Applicants, sufficient support is found in the specification, especially at page 5, lines 2-12.

The Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to illustrate a plurality of processing devices of a corresponding plurality of driver-information devices. Applicants have amended the drawings and, based on this amendment, submit that this object has been obviated.

Claims 20-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, for failing to provide an enabling disclosure for the claimed feature of a plurality of processing devices of a corresponding plurality of driver-information devices. As explained above, this feature is supported by page 5, lines 2-12, of the specification.

Claims 20-26, 29-39, 44-47, 50, 52-56, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,006,161 to Katou ("Katou"). In characterizing device 2 of Katou as a navigation system, the Examiner erred because device 2 only determines instantaneous position - it does not allow navigation itself. Therefore, device 2 is not a driver information device. In the last amendment, claims 20, 23, and 35 were amended to recite that a plurality of processing devices of a corresponding plurality of driver-information devices are connected to a data bus. Of the various devices shown in Figure 1 of Katou

connected to a data bus, only one, central processing device (CPD) 4, includes a processing device. Moreover, the connection of processors 40, 45, and 46 to either the internal bus of CPD 4 or, via interface 47, to the external data bus is irrelevant to the claims because processors 40, 45, and 46 are part of one device, and not individually part of "a corresponding plurality of devices." Therefore, Katou does not show a plurality of processing devices of a corresponding plurality of driver-information devices.

With respect to independent claims 50 and 54, which recites "only one output unit" that includes "one of a display and a loudspeaker", Katou shows more than just one such output unit. Katou shows four: speaker 16, touch panel 11, display 12, and printer 13. Therefore, because Katou does not limit itself to "only one output unit", Katou does not anticipate either of claims 50 and 54.

As for dependent claims 21, 22, 24-26, 29-34, 36-39, and 44-47, these dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons given for claims 20, 23, and 35. As for claims 52, 53, 55, 56, and 58, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons give for claim 40 and 54.

Claims 27, 28, and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Katou in view of United States Patent No. 6,208,934 to Bechtolsheim et al ("Bechtolsheim"). Since Bechtolsheim does not overcome the deficiencies noted above with respect to Katou, Applicants submit that claims 27, 28, and 40-43 are patentable for at least the same reasons given above for claims 23 and 35.

The present invention is new, non-obvious, and useful. Reconsideration and allowance of the presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/11/04

By: Richard L. Mayer  
Richard L. Mayer  
Reg. No. 22,490

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200




Fig. 1




Fig. 2




Fig. 3a